UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/591,496	09/01/2006	Alain Rhelimi	09669/093001	1844

22511   7590   10/07/2010

OSHA LIANG L.L.P.
TWO HOUSTON CENTER
909 FANNIN, SUITE 3500
HOUSTON, TX 77010

EXAMINER
DOAN, TRANG T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2431	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/07/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@oshaliang.com
buta@oshaliang.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/591,496	RHELIMI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	TRANG DOAN	2431	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 July 2010*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *01 November 2006* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is in response to amendment filed 07/08/2010.

2.   Claim 1 has been amended.

3.   Claims 1-21 are pending for consideration.

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 1, 4, 13-14, and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Susser et al. (US20050193218) (hereinafter Susser) in view of Lancu

et al. (US20050008098) (hereinafter Lancu).

      Regarding claim 1, Susser discloses a retrievable token comprising: at least one

physical channel of communication to at least one apparatus (Susser: paragraph 0013,

a smart card/small footprint device as the retrievable token is attached to a host

computer as the at lest one apparatus); a first logical channel associated with the at

least one physical channel, wherein the first logical channel is associated with a first

protocol stack and a first execution environment on the retrievable token (Susser:

paragraph 0069, the small footprint device may have one or more processing

machines); and a second logical channel associated with the at least one physical

channel, wherein the second logical channel is associated with a second protocol stack

and a second execution environment on the retrievable token (Susser: paragraph 0049,

the small footprint device may have one or more processing machines and paragraph

0075).

      Susser does not disclose to concurrently execute the first execution environment

and the second execution environment, and wherein executing the first execution

environment comprises executing the first protocol stack and executing the second

execution environment comprises executing the second protocol stack. However,

Lancu discloses to concurrently execute the first execution environment and the second

execution environment, and wherein executing the first execution environment

comprises executing the first protocol stack and executing the second execution

environment comprises executing the second protocol stack (Lancu: paragraph 0015).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled art at the time the invention

was made to have included in Susser the feature of Lancu as discussed above to

process data coming into the token faster by using multiple processing machines at the

time.

Regarding claim 4, Susser as modified by Lancu further discloses wherein the at least one apparatus is a personal computer (Susser: paragraph 0067).

Regarding claim 13, Susser as modified by Lancu further discloses wherein said retrievable token includes at least two physical channels and at least one of said physical channels is independent from the other(s) (Susser: paragraph 0067 and paragraph 0069).

Regarding claim 14, Susser as modified by Lancu further discloses wherein said retrievable token comprises a first application and a second application, wherein the retrievable token is configured to execute the first application in the first execution environment and the second application in the second execution environment, and wherein said retrievable token comprises a resource that is shared between the first application and the second application (Susser: paragraph 0075).

Regarding claim 20, Susser as modified by Lancu further discloses wherein the retrievable token is configured to execute the first application and the second application simultaneously (Susser: paragraph 0075).

Regarding claim 21, Susser as modified by Lancu further discloses wherein the retrievable token is configured to implement a communication protocol between the first application and the second application, wherein the communication protocol enables

secure sharing of data and/or functions between the first application and the second

application (Susser: paragraph 0072).

7.   Claims 2-3 and 6-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Susser in view of Lancu, and further in view of Nagamasa et al (US 20040177215)

(hereinafter Nagamasa).

        Regarding claim 2, Susser in view of Lancu does not disclose wherein the

retrievable token is a Multi Media Memory card. However, Nagamasa discloses

wherein the retrievable token is a Multi Media Memory card (Nagamasa: paragraph

0042). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time

the invention was made to have included in Susser in view of Lancu the feature of

Nagamasa as discussed above because in order to realize the full range of benefits

offered by the advanced smart card operating environment, inter-application

functionality and communication must be facilitated. That is, one application must be

able to call another application during a session. Further, applications must be able to

securely communicate to another within the smart card operating environment.

        Regarding claim 3, Susser as modified by Lancu and Nagamasa further

discloses wherein the at least one apparatus is a mobile communication handset

(Nagamasa: paragraph 0042).

Regarding claim 6, Susser as modified by Lancu and Nagamasa further

discloses wherein said at least one physical channel of communication is configured to

use SPI protocol (Nagamasa: paragraph 0061).

Regarding claim 7, Susser as modified by Lancu and Nagamasa further

discloses wherein said at least one physical channel of communication is configured to

use MMC protocol (Nagamasa: paragraph 0042).

Regarding claim 8, Susser as modified by Lancu and Nagamasa further

discloses wherein said at least one physical channel of communication is configured to

use a protocol for contactless smart card (Nagamasa: paragraph 0001: flash memory).

Regarding claim 9, Susser as modified by Lancu and Nagamasa further

discloses wherein the protocol of communication is defined in the ISO (FCD) 15693

(Nagamasa: paragraph 0046).

Regarding claim 10, Susser as modified by Lancu and Nagamasa further

discloses wherein the protocol is defined in the ISO 14443 (Nagamasa: paragraph

0051).

Regarding claim 11, Susser as modified by Lancu and Nagamasa further

discloses wherein said at least one physical channel is configured to use at least one

protocol defined in the TS 102.221 standard (Nagamasa: paragraph 0109).

Regarding claim 12, Susser as modified by Lancu and Nagamasa further

discloses wherein said at least one physical channel is configured to use at least one

protocol defined in the ISO 7816 standard (Nagamasa: paragraph 0094).

8.   Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Susser in

view of Lancu, and further in view of Fruhauf et al (US 6883715) (hereinafter Fruhauf).

Regarding claim 5, Susser in view of Lancu does not disclose wherein said at

least one physical channel of communication is configured to use USB protocol.

However, Fruhauf discloses wherein said at least one physical channel of

communication is configured to use USB protocol (Fruhauf: column 8, lines 22-33).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled art at the time the invention

was made to have included in Susser in view of Lancu the feature of Fruhauf as

discussed above to provide an integrated circuit which can selectively operate in

accordance with more than one protocol (Fruhauf: column 4, lines 6-9).

9.   Claims 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Susser in view of Lancu, and further in view of Wilkinson et al. (US 20030023954)

(hereinafter Wilkinson).

        Regarding claim 15, Susser in view of Lancu does not disclose wherein the

retrievable token comprises an access condition list (ACL) and said resource is shared

by the first application and the second application on the basis of said access condition

list (ACL). However, Wilkinson discloses wherein the retrievable token comprises an

access condition list (ACL) and said resource is shared by the first application and the

second application on the basis of said access condition list (ACL) (Wilkinson:

paragraphs 0125-0129). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled art

at the time the invention was made to have included in Susser in view of Lancu the

feature of Wilkinson as discussed above because the access control list furnishes an

indication of types of access to be granted to the identity, and based on the access

control list, the processor selectively grants specific types of access (Wilkinson:

paragraph 0024)

        Regarding claim 16, Susser as modified by Lancu and Wilkinson further

discloses wherein the resource is a shared file, and wherein said access conditions of

the access conditions list (ACL) associates respective applications with respective

operations on the shared file thereby authorizing said respective applications to perform

said respective operations on the shared file (Wilkinson: paragraphs 0117 and 0132).

Regarding claim 17, Susser as modified by Lancu and Wilkinson further

discloses wherein the resource is a shared object on which data is written in a "first in

first out" (FIFO) manner and wherein access conditions are defined in the access

conditions list (ACL) associating respective applications with respective operations on

the shared object thereby authorizing said respective applications to perform said

respective operations on the shared object (Wilkinson: paragraphs 0128 and 0129).

Regarding claim 18, Susser as modified by Lancu and Wilkinson further

discloses wherein the retrievable token stores and runs an operating system which is

common to the first application and the second application and wherein the resource is

a shared function that is implemented by the operating system and for which access

conditions are defined in the access conditions list (ACL) which specify respective rights

of the applications to invoke said shared function (Wilkinson: paragraphs 0117 and

0128-0129).

Regarding claim 19, Susser as modified by Lancu and Wilkinson further

discloses wherein the first application is configured to share a function with the second

application by allowing the second application to invoke the function and where access

conditions list (ACL) are defined in the retrievable token for the second application to

access the shared function (Wilkinson: paragraphs 0128-0129).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TRANG DOAN whose telephone number is (571)272-0740. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William R. Korzuch can be reached on (571) 272-7589. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Trang Doan/
Examiner, Art Unit 2431

/Kaveh Abrishamkar/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2431